REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 14, and 18 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 8, and 14 are independent claims. Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 14, and 18 have been amended, claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, 13, 15-17, and 19-20 have been canceled, and no new claims have been added. Applicants are not conceding in this Application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the remaining claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

In particular, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 2-4 and 6-7, and have therefore canceled claims 2-4 and 6-7. Similarly, Applicants have amended independent claim 8 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 9-11 and 13 and have therefore canceled claims 9-11 and 13. Finally, Applicants have amended independent claim 14 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 15-17, and 19-20 and have therefore canceled claims 15-17, and 19-20.

Examiner Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner Interview conducted on April 9, 2008 between Applicants' undersigned attorney, Examiners Hoang and Examiner Kenny Lin. During the interview, Applicants' Attorney primarily argued that U.S. Patent Pub. 2002/0085579 by Sullivan et al. (hereinafter "Sullivan") did not teach a "redirection server" as taught and claimed by Applicants in claim 3. Instead, Sullivan merely teaches a centralized database that, in one implementation, is stored in a "registry server." Sullivan's "registry server" is used to provide data to computer systems upon request but does not provide any functionality to "redirect" the client to a different home page, as taught and claimed by Applicants. After further discussion, Examiner Lin essentially agreed that Sullivan teaches something different (a "registry server" instead

of a "redirection server") and that the two different types of servers provide different functionality. However, Examiner Lin suggested amending the claims to make it more clear as to how the timestamps and connection identifiers are being used in Applicants' invention in order to further distinguish Applicants' claims from the teachings of Sullivan and in order to avoid any potential § 103 (obviousness) rejections in future Office Actions. Applicants appreciate the Examiners' suggestions and have amended the claims accordingly.

Drawings

Applicants note with appreciation the acceptance, by the Examiner of Applicants' formal drawings that were filed on January 24, 2004.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-20 were objected to because allegedly, "the claim preambles are to general." Applicants note that no citation was provided by the Examiner showing any support in the MPEP where any level of specificity is required in the claim preambles. Indeed, Applicants' attorney is aware of no such requirement in the MPEP. Nevertheless in order to expedite examination of Applicants' remaining claims, Applicants have amended the preambles to provide more specificity. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the claims based on the claim preambles.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Original claims 14-20 (now remaining claims 14 and 18) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter and that the claims are allegedly directed to software per se. Applicants have amended the preamble of the independent claim (claim 14) so that the claims are now directed at computer instructions that are executed by an information handling system. In light of Applicants' amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended,

are directed at statutory subject matter and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - Alleged Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 14, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being taught, and therefore anticipated, by U.S. Patent Pub. 2002/0085579 by Sullivan et al. (hereinafter "Sullivan"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As previously noted, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 2-4 and 6-7, and have therefore canceled claims 2-4 and 6-7. Similarly, Applicants have amended independent claim 8 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 9-11 and 13 and have therefore canceled claims 9-11 and 13. Finally, Applicants have amended independent claim 14 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 15-17, and 19-20 and have therefore canceled claims 15-17, and 19-20.

As amended, each of the independent claims are directed at a redirection web server that provides a home page identifier to a client computing device (see amended preambles). Taking claim 1 as an exemplary independent claim, the limitations found in the independent claim include:

- receiving, over a computer network, at a redirection web site, a home page request from the client computing device, the home page request including a user identifier that identifies a user of the client device, wherein the redirection web site performs the steps including:
  - obtaining a timestamp identifying a current time and a current day;
  - obtaining one or more network connection identifiers that identify one or more computer networks to which the client computing device is connected from the home page request;
  - retrieving, from a nonvolatile storage device, the home page identifier, wherein the retrieving further comprises:

- ♦ selecting, from the nonvolatile storage device, one or more records that correspond to the user identifier, wherein the nonvolatile storage device includes records for a plurality of user identifiers; and
- ♦ identifying, from the group of selected records, the home page identifier based upon the obtained timestamp and the obtained network connection identifiers; and
- ▪ setting a browser's home page to the retrieved home page identifier, wherein the setting of the browser's home page includes redirecting the browser executing on the client computing device to the retrieved home page identifier.

As amended, each of Applicants' independent claims is now directed at using a "redirection web site" that determines the home page for a client computing device based upon the current timestamp as well as the client's current network connections. As discussed during the Examiner interview, and as agreed by Examiner Lin, Sullivan does not teach using a "redirection web site" but instead uses a "registry server" that provides vastly different functionality. This vastly different functionality is set forth in Applicants' amended independent claims to further distinguish Applicants' claimed invention over the teachings of Sullivan. Specifically, by using the timestamp and the networks to which the client is currently connected, Applicants' "redirection web site" actually sets the client browser's home page to the home page identifier that was retrieved by the redirection web site and redirects the browser that is executing on the client computing device to the retrieved home page identifier (see last limitation).

In stark contrast, Sullivan's "registry server" is a server that hosts a register, which Sullivan describes as having a database structure (see Sullivan at [0025]). Sullivan goes on to describe the "registry server" as "a server capable of providing database services..." that is accessible over a computer network (see Sullivan at [0038]). Sullivan describes the devices in his system as having operating systems that "may use the registry 200 to store and access personal preferences for its operation." (Sullivan at [0038]). Therefore, as described by Sullivan, the "registry server" is simply

a remote registry (e.g., a database server) that does not perform any "redirecting" as taught and claimed by Applicants. Furthermore, Sullivan describes the devices that can use the "registry server" as "including an operating system that may use the registry..." (Sullivan at [0038]). In other words, the client computing devices that are used in Sullivan's system must have a level of sophistication to retrieve information from the registry server using the device's operating system. In contrast, Applicants' redirection server looks up the home page identifier and redirects the client computing device to the identified home page without requiring the client computing device to include or execute an operating system that is capable of retrieving data from a remote database and processing the data in order to determine the home page that the client computing device should use based upon the device's network connection and the current time of day (timestamp).

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 2131 which is directed at the application of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b), and (e) rejections. MPEP § 2131 states that "TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM." Applicants have demonstrated above that Sullivan does not teach each and every element found in Applicants' independent claims. Therefore, Applicants have overcome the rejection of Applicants' amended independent claims and have shown that such amended claims are not anticipated by Sullivan. Therefore, each of the independent claims (1, 8, and 14), is allowable over Sullivan. In addition, each of the remaining dependent claims (5, 12, and 18) each depend on one of the independent claims and, therefore, are allowable for at least the same reasons that the independent claims are allowable.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By   /Joseph T. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 44,383/

Joseph T. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 44,383
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorneys for Applicant
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742